

UTTARAVIHĀRATTHAKATHĀ AND SĀRASAMĀSA<sup>1</sup>  
Some Unattributed Non-Mahāvihārvāsin Sources for the Pāli  
Commentaries\*

Contents:

1. Controversial Points and Methodology
2. Examples found in the Visuddhimagga
3. Examples found in the Dīghatthakathā
4. Examples found in the Majjhimaṭṭhakathā
5. Examples found in the Saṃyuttaṭṭhakathā
6. Conclusion

**1. Controversial Points and Methodology**

The study of the sources is one of the most important and basic subjects in the field of Pāli Aṭṭhakathā literature<sup>2</sup>. The source material for this literature can be classified into six main groups:

1. The Tipiṭaka, i.e. the Pāli Canon
2. Three post-canonical texts: the Nettipakarana, Peṭakopadesa and Milindapañha
3. The Pāli Aṭṭhakathās themselves
4. The so-called Sīhaṭṭhakathā
5. Sources from schools other than the Mahāvihāra fraternity
6. Other minor sources

The fifth of these can be further divided into two:

- a. Views attributed to "Some" or "Others"
- b. Views attributed to "Sophists" (Vitaṇḍavādins)

Of these two, the latter has been discussed by me not only in Japanese<sup>3</sup> but also in English<sup>4</sup>; the former will be studied here.

The Pāli Aṭṭhakathās which have been transmitted down to the present time by the Mahāvihāra fraternity of the Theravāda school as its own texts frequently quote or refer to the views of "some" or "others" (āññe, itare, ekacce, eke, keci, pare, ye... te..., etc). These are almost always referred to in the plural form, which indicates a certain group, not a particular individual. The number of references is altogether about six hundred<sup>5</sup>. The names of these "others" are not usually given. Although the majority of them are unknown, some can be identified, through comments in the Tīkās, the commentaries on the Aṭṭhakathās. Those which are so identified can be divided into three groups:

1. The Abhayagirivihāra fraternity and its offshoot, i.e. the non-Mahāvihāra fraternity of the Theravāda school
2. Some groups (sometimes particular individuals) belonging to the Mahāvihāra fraternity
3. Mahāyāna or Hinayāna schools other than the Theravādins

Of these three, the first is the largest in number and of the greatest importance. The references in the Tīkās are to "Abhayagirivāsino", "Uttaravihāravāsino (-vāsikā, -vāsikatherā)", "Sārasamāsa-ācariyā", "Upatissa as the author of the Vimuttimagga", etc. These names are always in the plural with the exception of "Upatissa".

In addition, there can be found the proper name "Sārasamāsa", which is always in the locative singular, except in the compound "Sārasamāsa-ācariyā". This must be the name of a text. These names can be recognized as referring to non-Mahāvihāra fraternities or their texts. By investigating these unattributed quotations from the non-Mahāvihāravāsins, the present article aims to make clear the nature of the Aṭṭhakathā source materials as well as a certain relation between the Mahāvihāra and the non-Mahāvihāra traditions.

Several scholars have already paid attention to these unattributed sources. For instance, Rev. Nyanatiloka drew attention to those

which appear in the Visuddhimagga in his German translation of that text<sup>6</sup>, as did Professor Mizuno in his Japanese translation of the same text<sup>7</sup>, and also Rev. Nyanamoli in his English translation of the Visuddhimagga<sup>8</sup>. Professor Bapat also referred to them in his comparative study of the Vimuttimagga and the Visuddhimagga<sup>9</sup>. Professor de Silva threw new light on the unnamed figures mentioned in the Sumāngalavilāsini in the introduction to her edition of the Dīghaṭīkā<sup>10</sup>. With reference to the unattributed sources found in the Buddhavaṃsaṭṭhakathā and other Aṭṭhakathās, Dr. Horner published two articles in recent years<sup>11</sup>. All these studies, however, either are limited to a particular text or are too brief in their discussion, so that they never do more than bring the matter forward for consideration or point out the problems. Accordingly, there has as yet been no comprehensive research of a kind that can be expected to produce reliable conclusions.

I shall now explain my methodology. The unnamed sources which are identified as non-Mahāvihāravāsin (with the various expressions already stated) in the Tīkās<sup>12</sup> are forty-one in number, and they are found as follows:

1	[1]	Vism I 80	
2	[2]	Vism I 102	
3	[3]	Vism I 148	
4	[4]	Vism I 268	=[35]
5	[5]	Vism II 432	=[38]
6	[6]	Vism II 450	
7	[7]	Vism II 700	
8	[8]	Sv I 80	=[28], [37], [41]
9	[9]	Sv I 84	
10	[10]	Sv I 86f	=[36]
11	[11]	Sv I 93	
12	[12]	Sv I 114	
13	[13]	Sv I 150	

14	[14]	Sv I 152	
15	[15]	Sv I 162	=[30]
16	[16]	Sv I 184	=[27], [34], [40]
17	[17]	Sv I 250	
18	[18]	Sv II 437	
19	[19]	Sv II 514	
20	[20]	Sv II 642	=[39]
<hr/>			
21	[21]	Ps I 28	
22	[22]	Ps I 38	
23	[23]	Ps I 54	
24	[24]	Ps I 63	
25	[25]	Ps I 69	=[33]
26	[26]	Ps I 123	
	[27]	Ps I 253	=[16], [34], [40]
	[28]	Ps I 211	=[8], [37], [41]
27	[29]	Ps II 302	
	[30]	Ps III 230	=[15]
28	[31]	Ps IV 62	
<hr/>			
29	[32]	Spk I 208	
	[33]	Spk II 42	=[25]
	[34]	Spk III 183	=[16], [27], [40]
	[35]	Spk III 270	=[4]
<hr/>			
	[36]	Mp II 293	=[10]
	[37]	Mp III 194	=[8], [28], [41]
<hr/>			
	[38]	As 421	=[5]
<hr/>			
	[39]	Vibh-a 308	=[20]
	[40]	Vibh-a 348	=[16], [27], [34]
<hr/>			
	[41]	Pp-a 241	=[8], [28], [37]

In the above list, the second column shows their original numbers and the fourth column other passages that are basically the same. Most of these duplicated examples are identical not only with respect to the unattributed quotations themselves but also to the passages which precede and follow. Therefore, the number in the first column in this list indicates the real number, excluding all duplications. That is to say, the total number of all the examples amounts to forty-one, while the real number of examples after eliminating the duplicates is twenty-nine. Although each example usually contains only one unattributed quotation, in some instances several quotations are found together, so that each example consists of a passage concerning one topic but not necessarily one quotation: in some instances there is more than one quotation. The twenty-nine examples are distributed as follows: seven in the Visuddhimagga, thirteen in the Dīghaṭṭhakathā, eight in the Majjhimaṭṭhakathā, and one in the Saṃyuttaṭṭhakathā. In the following sections of this article, they will be examined one by one in the order in which they appear in the list given above.

## 2. Examples found in the Visuddhimagga

### 1. Example One

#### A. Vism (I 79 *foll.*)

Tattha kusalattikato ti sabbān' eva hi dhutaṅgāni sekhaputhujjanakhīṇasavānam vasena siyā kusalāni, siyā avyākatāni, n' atthi dhutaṅgam akusalan ti . . . Yesam pi kusalattikavinimuttam dhutaṅgam, tesam attatho dhutaṅgam eva n' atthi. Asantam kassa dhunanato dhutaṅgam nāma bhavissati, dhutaguṇe samādāya vattatiti vacanavirodho pi ca nesam āpajjati; tasmā tam na gahetabban ti.

#### B. Vism-mhṭ (I 180, 4-6)

**Yesan** ti Abhayagirivāsike sandhāyāha. Te hi dhutaṅgam nāma paññattī ti vadanti. Tathā sati tassa paramatthato avijjamānato kilesānam dhunanaṭho pi na siyā, samādātabbatā cā ti tesam vacanam Pāliyā virujjhati ti dassetum - "kusalattikavinimuttam" ti ādi vuttam.

C. Ged (Taishō Vol 32, p 406b)<sup>a</sup>

**Question:** Who is called an observer of the ascetic practice (dhutaṅga)? How many kinds of the ascetic practice are there? . . .

**Answer:** There are thirteen ascetic practices: these are taught by the Buddha and are the precepts of the Buddha. These are called the ascetic practice. As regards them, the skilful (kusala), the unskilful (akusala) and the non-characterizable (avyākata) should not be discussed.

D. rnam par grol bahi lam las slyāns paḥi yon tan bstan pa<sup>13</sup>

De la sbyāns paḥi yan lag ni ci žig yin | . . . De la sbyāns paḥi yan lag ces bya ba ni gži bcu gsum po de dag gi spos ba gaṇ yin pa de ni sbyāns paḥi yan lag yin no | Sbyāns paḥi yon tan cir brjod par bya že na l dge bar brjod par byaho |

As shown above, the view on the dhutaṅga, which is recorded as a divergent opinion in the Visuddhimagga (A), and which is said to be that of the Abhayagirivāsikas in its Tikā (B), accords with a view stated in the Gedatsudōron, the Chinese version of the Vimuttimagga (C). On the other hand, the Tibetan translation of Vim (D) does not agree with the Gedatsudōron (C) in this passage.

## 2. Example Two

A. Vism (I 102 *foll.*)

Tatra purimā tāva tisso cariyā pubbāciṇṇanidānā dhātudosanidānā cā ti **ekacce** vadanti. Pubbe kira itthappayogasubhakammabahulo

rāgacarito hoti; saggā vā cavitvā idhūpapanno. Pubbe chedanavadhabandhanaverakammabahulo dosacarito hoti; nirayanāgayonihi vā cavitvā idhūpapanno. Pubbe majjapānabahulo sutaparipucchāvihino ca mohacarito hoti, tiracchānayoniyā vā cavitvā idhūpapanno ti. Evaṁ pubbāciṇṇanidānā ti vadanti. Dvinnam pana dhātūnam ussannattā puggalo mohacarito hoti: pathavīdhātuyā ca āpodhātuyā ca. Itarāsam dvinnam ussannattā dosacarito. Sabbāsam samattā pana rāgacarito ti. Dosesu ca semhādhiko rāgacarito hoti, vātādhiko mohacarito, semhādhiko vā mohacarito, vātādhiko vā rāgacarito ti evaṁ dhātudosanidānā ti vadanti.

B. Vism-mhṭ (I 221, 8)

**Ekacce** ti Upatissatheram sandhāyāha, tena hi Vimuttimagge tathā vuttam.

C. Ged (Taishō Vol 32, p 410a)<sup>b</sup>

**Question:** What are the causes of these three kinds of behaviour? How may it be known that this is a man of greedy temperament, that is a man of angry temperament and yet another is a man of infatuated temperament? . . . **Answer:** Deeds done in the past are causes of behaviour. The elements are causes of behaviour. The cardinal humours are causes of behaviour. How do deeds done in the past become causes of behaviour? One who has accumulated good actions in past existences through desirable means becomes a man of greedy temperament, and also one who, passing away from a heavenly mansion, is reborn here. One who (in past existences) has perpetrated many undesirable deeds of killing, maiming, capturing and bearing a grudge becomes a man of angry temperament, and also one who, passing away from hell or a serpent state, is reborn here. One who (in past existences) has enjoyed much drinking and has been devoid (of learning and questioning) becomes a man of infatuated temperament, and also one who, passing away from a bestial state, is reborn here. Thus

deeds done in the past become causes of behaviour. How do elements become causes of behaviour? Because of the heightening of two elements, one becomes a man of infatuated temperament. These are the earth element (element of extension) and the water element (element of cohesion). Because of the heightening of two elements, one becomes a man of angry temperament. These are the fire element (element of heat) and the wind element (element of mobility). Because of the equalising of all elements, one becomes a man of greedy temperament. Thus the different elements become causes of behaviour. How do the cardinal humours become causes of behaviour? One who has an excess of phlegm becomes a man of greedy temperament. One who has an excess of choler becomes a man of angry temperament, and one who has an excess of wind becomes a man of infatuated temperament.

There is another view: one who has an excess of phlegm becomes a man of infatuated temperament and one who has an excess of wind becomes a man of greedy temperament. Thus the cardinal humours become causes of behaviour.

The above comment of the Visuddhimaggatikā (B) is the only reference so far known to Upatissa, the author of the Vimuttimagga, and also to the text itself throughout all the Atṭhakathās and Tīkās. From this comment it is certain that Dhammapāla, the author of the Paramatthamañjūsā, consulted the Vimuttimagga of Upatissa. The above passage from the Chinese version of the Vimuttimagga (C) basically corresponds with the quotation by 'Some' in the Visuddhimagga (A).

### 3. Example Three

#### A. Vism (I 148)

Tatra paṭipadā-visuddhi nāma sasambhāriko upacāro, upekkhānubrūhaṇā nāma appanā, sampahāṃsanā nāma paccavekkhaṇā ti evam eke vanṇayanti. Yasmā pana: ekattagatam

cittam paṭipadā-visuddhi pakkhannañ<sup>14</sup> c' eva hoti upekkhānubrūhitañ ca, ñānenā ca sampahāṃsanā ti. Pāliyam vuttam, tasmā anto appanāyam eva āgamanavasena paṭipadā-visuddhi. Tatra majjhattupekkhāya kiccavasena upekkhānubrūhaṇā, dhammānaṃ anativattanādibhāvasādhanena pariyoḍāpakassa ñānassa kiccanipphattivasena sampahāṃsanā ca veditabbā.

#### B. Vism-mhṭ (I 314, 11-12)

**Eke** ti Abhayagirivāsino. Te hi evam patipadā-visuddhi-ādike vanṇayanti, tad ayuttaṇi.

#### C. Ged (Taishō Vol 32, p 417a)<sup>c</sup>

(The three kinds of goodness: there are the initial, medial and final stages of goodness. Purity of practice is the initial stage; the increase of equanimity is the medial stage; and rejoicing is the final stage.) What is the purity of practice? It is the foundation of all goodness. What is the increase of equanimity? It is the fixed meditation (appanā samādhi). What is rejoicing? It is reviewing (paccavekkhaṇā). Thus there are three kinds of goodness in the First Meditation.

If we compare the quotation from **eke**, i.e. the Abhayagirivāsins, in the Visuddhimagga (A) with the parallel passages in the Gedatsudōron (C), we find that these passages on the three kinds of goodness in the First Meditation accord with one another, except for the explanation of the purity of practice (paṭipadā-visuddhi). This minor difference arises probably from an incorrect translation into Chinese.

### 4. Example Four

#### A. Vism (I 266)

Idāni yan tam Bhagavatā: "Ayam pi kho, bhikkhave, ānāpānasati-samādhi bhāvito bahulikato santo c' eva pañito ca asecanako ca sukho ca vihāro uppānuppanne ca pāpake akusale dhamme thānaso antaradhāpeti vūpasameti" ti evam pasam̄sitvā; - "Katham bhāvito ca, bhikkhave, ānāpānasati-samādhi? Katham bahulikato santo c' eva pañito ca asecanako ca sukho ca vihāro uppānuppanne ca pāpake akusale dhamme thānaso antaradhāpeti vūpasameti? . . ."

#### B. Vism (I 268)

Asecanako ca sukho ca vihāro ti ethha pana n' āssa secanan ti asecanako; anāsittako abbokinno pātiyekko<sup>15</sup> āveniko. N' atthi ethha parikammaṇa vā upacārena vā santatā; ādi-samannāhārato pabhuti attano sabhāven' eva santo ca pañito cā ti attho. **Keci** pana asecanako ti anāsittako ojavanto sabhāven' eva madhuro ti vadanti. Evam ayam asecanako<sup>16</sup> ca appitappitakkhaṇe kāyikacetasikasukhapātiṭṭhāya saṃvattanato sukho ca vihāro ti veditabbo.

#### C. Vism-mhṭ (I 566, 8)

**Keci** ti Uttaravihāravāsike sandhāyāha.

#### D. Ged (Taishō Vol 32, p 429c)<sup>d</sup>

**Question:** What is the concentration by respiration? What is the practising of it? What are its salient characteristic, function, near cause and benefits? What is its procedure? **Answer:** Inhalation (āna) is in-breathing. Exhalation (apāna) is out-breathing. On the occasion of in-breathing and out-breathing, one concentrates, is concentrated and is rightly concentrating. This is called the concentration by in-breathing and out-breathing. The state in which one's mind is steady and undisturbed is called the practising of it. Causing the arising of perception as regards respiration is its salient characteristic. Attending to contact (phassa) is its function. Removal of discursive thought (vitakka) is its near cause. What

are its benefits? If a man practises the concentration of respiration, he attains to the calm (santa), the exquisite (pañita), the brilliant and lovely, and the blissful life (sukha vihāra).

This example, which is concerned with the exposition on "ānāpānasati" is exceptionally specific. It begins with two quotations from the Samyuttanikāya (A). After quoting these two passages from SN (V 321 §9; V 322 §11), Buddhaghosa comments on some words or phrases in the latter quotation. When commenting upon them, he refers to the Samyuttaṭṭhakathā of the Mahāvihāra. Buddhaghosa's comments, with almost identical wording, recur in Spk<sup>17</sup>. On the other hand, the parallel passage in the Gedatsudōron (D) does not contain any quotation from SN at this point, though it partially accords with the second quotation of Vism; with the result that it does not, unlike SN, have any comment on "asecanaka". Consequently, Buddhaghosa must have consulted the Samyutta commentary of the Uttaravihāra and taken from it an alternative explanation. It is to be noted that the explanation of "asecanaka" by the Uttaravihāra is not criticised or denied here by him.

#### 5. Example Five

##### A. Vism (II 432)

Tattha **keci** khanapaccuppannam cittam cetopariyaññānassa ārammaṇaṁ hotī ti vadanti. Kip kāraṇā? Yasmā iddhimato ca parassa ca ekakkhaṇe cittam uppajatī ti; idañ ca nesam opammap: - Yathā ākāse khitte pupphamuṭṭhimhi avassam ekam puppham ekassa vanṭena vanṭam pativijjhati, evam parassa cittam jānissāmī ti rāsivasena mahājanassa citte āvajjite avassam ekassa cittam ekena cittena uppādakkhaṇe vā ṭhitikkhaṇe vā bhaṅgakkhaṇe vā pativijjhati ti. Tam pana vassasatam pi vassasahassam pi āvajjanto yena ca cittena āvajjati, yena ca jānāti, tesam dvinnam sahaṭṭhānābhāvato āvajjanajavanānañ ca aniṭṭhatānē nānārammaṇabhbāvappattidosato ayuttan ti Aṭṭhakathāsu

paṭikkhittam. Santatipaccuppannam pana addhāpaccuppannañ ca ārammaṇam hotī ti veditabbam.

#### B. Vism-mhṭ (II 935, 13)

**Kecī** ti Abhayagirivāsino.

The explanation attributed to "some", i.e. the Abhayagirivāsins, in the Visuddhimagga cannot be found in the Gedatsudōron<sup>18</sup>. Buddhaghosa quotes it not from the Gedatsudōron, but from some old Aṭṭhakathās which were his source materials and which are referred to at the end of the above passage (A). From this evidence, it is clear that some old commentaries of the Mahāvihāra had a reference on this matter to the view of the Abhayagiri, which was rejected by Buddhaghosa.

#### 6. Example Six

##### A. Vism (II 450)

Imāni tāva Pāliyam āgatarūpān' eva. Aṭṭhakathāyam pana balarūpam, sambhavarūpam, jātirūpam, rogarūpam, ekaccānañ matena middharūpan ti evam aññāni pi rūpāni āharitvā: addhā munī 'si sambuddho, n' atthi nīvaraṇā tavā ti ādīni vatvā middharūpam tāva n' atthi yevā ti paṭikkhittam. Itaresu rogarūpam jaratā-aniccatā-gahañena gahitam eva, jātirūpam upacaya-santatigahañena, sambhavarūpam āpodhātugahañena, balarūpam vāyodhātugahañena gahitam eva. Tasmā tesu ekam pi visum n' atthi ti sanniṭṭhānam katañ.

##### B. Vism-mhṭ (II 988, 3)

**Ekaccānañ** ti Abhayagirivāsīnam.

##### C. Ged (Taishō Vol 32, 445c)<sup>e</sup>

What are the derived material qualities (upādā-rūpas)? These are the sense-organs of eye, ear, nose, tongue, body, matter as a sense-object, sound as a sense-object, odour as a sense-object, taste as a sense-object, femininity, masculinity, life-principle, body-intimation, speech-intimation, element of space, buoyancy of matter, impressibility of matter, adaptability of matter, integration of matter, continuity of matter, occurrence of matter, decay of matter, impermanency of matter, solid food, the basis of the material element and the material quality of torpor.

According to the Khandhaniddesa in the Visuddhimagga (II 443 foll.), the rūpakkhandha is divided into the four bhūta-rūpas and the twenty-four upādā-rūpas: the former are the paṭhavī-dhātu, āpo-dhātu, tejo-dhātu and vāyo-dhātu, while the latter are cakkhu, sota, ghāna, jīvhā, kāya, rūpa, sadda, gandha, rasa, itthindriya, purisindriya, jīvitindriya, hadayavatthu, kāyavimñatti, vacivimñatti, ākāsadhadhātu, rūpassa lahutā, rūpassa mudutā, rūpassa kammaññattā, rūpassa upacaya, rūpassa santati, rūpassa jaratā, rūpassa aniccatā and kabalijñikārāhāra.

Immediately after the passage listing these twenty-eight rūpakkhandhas (in the Visuddhimagga), we find the above quotation (A), which states that some others (ekacce) include the middharūpa in them. According to the Visuddhimaggatīkā (B), it is clear that these others were the Abhayagirivāsins. On the other hand, the Gedatsudōron (C) lists twenty-six upādā-rūpas. Almost all of them are the same as those in the Visuddhimagga, but the middha-rūpa is exceptionally included in them, as was pointed out by Dhammapāla. He must have known this passage of the Gedatsudōron.

#### 7. Example Seven

##### A. Vism (II 700)

**Ye pana vadanti:** sotāpanno: phalasamāpattim samāpajjissāmī ti vipassanam paṭṭhapetvā sakadāgāmī hoti, sakadāgāmī ca anāgāmī ti, te vattabbā: evam sati anāgāmī arahā bhavissati, arahā paccekabuddho, paccekabuddho ca buddho; tasmā na kiñci etam, Pāliwasen' eva ca paṭikkhittan ti pi na gahetabbam. Idam eva pana gahetabbam: sekhassā pi phalam eva uppajjati, na maggo. Phalañ c' assa sace tena paṭhamajjhāniko maggo adhigato hoti, paṭhamajjhānikam eva uppajjati. Sace dutiyādisu aññatarajjhāniko, dutiyādisu aññatarajjhānikam evā ti. Evam tāv' assā samāpajjanam hoti.

### B. Vism-mhṭ (III 1662, 1-2)

**Ye panā** ti Abhayagirivāsino sandhāyāha. Te hi maggaphalavipassanāya āloletvā vadanti.

The unnamed persons (ye ..., te ...) who are referred to in the Visuddhimagga (A) can be identified as the Abhayagirivāsins, according to its commentary (B). We cannot, however, find any passage closely corresponding to the above quotation of their view (in the Gedatsudōron); we can only find in this text an explanation which seems to have been made to answer the above criticism of the Mahāvihāra fraternity<sup>f</sup>.

### 3. Examples found in the Dīghaṭṭhakathā

#### 1. Example Eight

##### A. Sv (I 80) commenting upon DN (I 5)

Sāci-yogo ti kuṭila-yogo. Etesam̄ yeva ukkoṭanādinam etam nāmam. Tasmā ukkoṭana-sāci-yogā vañcana-sāci-yogā nikati-sāci-yogā ti evam ettha attho daṭṭhabbo. Keci aññam dassetvā aññassa parivattanam sāci-yogo ti vadanti, tam pana vañcanen' eva samgahitam.

#### B. Sv-t (I 160)

**Keci** ti Sārasamāsācariyā Uttaravihāravāsino ca.

From the above comment of the Dīghaṭṭikā (B), it is obvious that although the Sārasamāsa-ācariyas were not identical with the Uttaravihāravāsins, nevertheless they had so close a relationship with one another that they shared a common explanation on this subject. Further examples will be shown later on. Incidentally, the above quotation of Sv (A), together with the preceding and following passages, is basically the same as those of the Majjhimaṭṭhakathā (II 211), the Aṅguttaraṭṭhakathā (III 194) and the Puggalapaññatti-aṭṭhakathā (241). Of these parallel passages, the comments of the Majjhimaṭṭikā upon Ps<sup>19</sup> and of the Aṅguttaraṭṭikā upon Mp<sup>20</sup> accord with that of the Dīghaṭṭikā upon Sv; whereas the Puggalapaññattiṭṭikā upon Pp-a<sup>21</sup> does not give any comment on this passage.

#### 2. Example Nine

##### A. DN (I 6)

"Yathā vā pan' eke bhonto samaṇa-brāhmaṇā saddhā-deyyāni bhojanāni bhūñijitvā te evarūpam visūka-dassanam anuyuttā viharanti - seyyathidañ naccañ gitāñ vāditam pekkham akkhānam pāñissaram vetālam kumbha-thūnam sobha-nagarakan . . . anikā-dassanam - iti vā iti evarūpā visūka-dassanā paṭivirato Samāṇo Gotamo ti".

##### B. Sv (I 84)

Pekkhan ti naṭa-samajjā. Akkhānan ti . . . Pāñissaran ti . . . Vetālan ti ghana-tālam, mantena mata-sariruṭṭhapanan ti pi **eke**. Kumbha-thūnan ti caturassara-ammanaka-tālam, kumbha-saddan ti pi **eke**. Sobhanagarakan ti, naṭānam abbhokkiranam, sobhanagarakan vā paṭibhānacittan ti vuttam hoti.

## C. Sv-ṭ (I 163)

Sārasamāse pana pekkham̄ mahan ti vuttam . . . Eke ti Sārasamāsācariyā Uttaravihāravāsino ca. Yathā c' ettha evam̄ ito paresu pi eke ti āgataṭṭhāne . . . Sobhanagarakan ti sobhanāgārakam̄. Sobhanagharkan ti Sārasamāse vuttam̄.

By the expression "Sārasamāse" (locative masculine singular) in the above passage (C), it is clearly proved that the Sārasamāsa was the name of a text, implying that the Sārasamāsa-ācariyas are the teachers who composed and transmitted this text.

## 3. Example Ten

## A. DN (I 7)

"Yathā vā pan' eke bhonto samaṇa-brāhmaṇā saddhā-deyyāni bhojanānī bhuñjivtā te evarūpam uccāsayana-mahāsayanam̄ anuyuttā viharanti - seyyathidaṁ āsandim̄ pallan̄kam̄ gonakam̄ cittakam̄ paṭikam̄ paṭalikam̄ tūlikam̄ vikatikam̄ uddha<sup>22</sup>-lomiṁ kāṭṭhissam . . ."

## B. Sv, Sv-ṭ

(1) Sv (I 86): pallanko ti pādesu vāla-rūpāni ṭhapetvā kato. Sv-ṭ (I 164): Vāla-rūpāni ti āharimāni vālarūpāni. Akappiyarūp' ākulo akappiyamañco pallanko ti Sārasamāse.

(2) Sv (I 87): Uddha<sup>23</sup>-lomi ti ubhato dasam̄ unṇāmayattharanam̄. Keci ekato uggata-pupphan ti vadanti. Sv-ṭ (I 164): Uddhalomiyam̄ keci ti Sārasamāsācariyā Uttaravihāravāsino ca.

(3) Sv (I 87): Ekanta-lomi ti ekato dasam̄ unṇāmayattharanam̄. Keci ubhato uggata-pupphan ti vadanti. Sv-ṭ (I 164 - continued from (2) above): Tathā ek' antalomiyam̄.

The same comment as Sv given above can be seen in Mp (II 292 foll.), and the comment of Sv-ṭ upon Sv shown above is also identical with that of Mp-ṭ (II 158, 7-8, 10) upon that passage of Mp.

## 4. Example Eleven

## A. Sv (I 93) commenting upon DN (I 9)

Bhūri-vijjā ti bhūri-ghare vasantena uggahetabba-manto.

## B. Sv-ṭ (I 167)

Bhūrivijjā sassavuddhikaraṇavijjā ti Sārasamāse.

(A) is, needless to say, the orthodox view of the Mahāvihāra given by Buddhaghosa and (B) is a divergent comment of the Sārasamāsa introduced by Dhammapāla.

## 5. Example Twelve

## A. DN (I 19)

Santi, bhikkhave, Khīḍdā-padosikā nāma devā. Te ativelam̄ hassakhiḍdā-rati-dhamma-samāpannā viharanti. Tesam̄ ativelam̄ hassa-khiḍdā-rati-dhamma-samāpannānaṁ viharataṁ sati mussati, satiyā sammosā te devā tamhā kāyā cavanti.

## B. Sv (I 114)

Katame pana te devā ti? Ime nāmā ti aṭṭhakathāya vicāranā n' athi. Devatānam̄ kammaja-tejo balavā hoti, karajam mandan ti avisesena vuttattā pana ye keci kabaliṅkārāhārūpajivino devā evam̄ karonti, te evam̄ cavantī ti veditabbā, ye keci pan' āhu Nimmānarati-Paranimmita<sup>24</sup>-vasavattino te devā ti. Khīḍdāya padussana-matten' eva h' ete khīḍdā-padosikā ti vuttā.

## C. Sv-ṭ (I 207)

Kecī ti Abhayagirivāsino.

This is a very useful and interesting example. When Buddhaghosa was about to comment on the words "te devā" in DN, he could not find anything concerning this phrase in the old commentary of the Mahāvihāra, called simply "Aṭṭhakathā" here. He then consulted a commentary of the Abhayagiri, which gave the above comment upon "te devā" (B). It goes without saying that "te devā" (these heavenly beings), the particular phrase under consideration, is neither a technical term on doctrine nor a proper name, but a specific phrase which is to be properly commented upon only in a particular context. In other words, this phrase has no general meaning, independent of a particular context. Therefore the text which commented upon this phrase must have been a commentary, not an Abhidhammic thesis or a dictionary work. Some similar instances will be seen later.

## 6. Example Thirteen

A. DN (I 49 *foll.*)

Atha kho rājño Māgadhassa Ajātasattussa Vedehi-puttassa avidūre Ambavanassa ahud eva bhayaṁ, ahu chambhitattaṁ ahu lomahaṁso. Atha kho rājā Māgadho Ajātasattu Vedehi-putto bhito saṁviggo loma-haṭṭhajāto Jivakaṁ komārabhaccāṁ etad avoca . . .

## B. Sv (I 150)

Kasmā pan' esa bhito ti? Andhakārenā ti eke vadanti. "Rājagahe kira dvattimśa mahā-dvārāni catusaṭhi khuddaka-dvārāni. Jīvakassa Ambavanam pākārassa ca Gijha-kūṭassa ca antarā hoti. So pācina-dvāreṇa nikkhāmitvā pabbata-chāyām pāvisi. Tathā pabbatakūṭena cando chādito, pabbata-chāyāya ca rukkha-chāyāya ca

andhakāram ahosi" ti. Tam akāraṇam. Tadā hi ukkānaṁ satasahassa pi paricchedo n' atthi.

## C. Sv-ṭ (I 280)

Eke ti Uttaravihārvāsino.

Here the interpretation of the Uttaravihārvāsins is rejected by Buddhaghosa.

## 7. Example Fourteen

## A. DN (I 50)

Atha kho rājā Māgadho Ajātasattu Vedehi-putto yāvatikā nāgassa bhūmi nāgena gantvā, nāgā paccorohitvā pattiko va yena maṇḍalamālāssa dvāram ten' upasaṅkami, upasaṅkamitvā Jivakam komārabhaccāṁ etad avoca: "Kahaṁ pana samma Jivaka Bhagavā?" ti. "Eso mahā-rāja Bhagavā. Eso mahā-rāja Bhagavā majjhimaṁ thambhaṁ nissāya puratthābhimukkho nisinno purakkhato bhikkhusaṅghassā" ti.

## B. Sv (I 152)

Kahaṁ pana sammā ti. Kasmā pucchatī? Eke tāva ajānanto ti vadanti. "Iminā kira dahara-kāle pitarā saddhiṁ āgamma Bhagavā diṭṭha-pubbo. Pacchā pana pāpa-mitta-saṁsaggene pitu-ghāṭam katvā abhimāre pesetvā dhana-pālakam muñcāpetvā mahāparādho hutvā Bhagavato sammukhi-bhāvam na upagata-pubbo ti asañjānanto pucchatī" ti. Tam akāraṇam. Bhagavā hi ākiṇī-vara-lakkhaṇo anuvyāfi-jana-paṭimandito chabbanṇāhi rasmīhi sakala-ārāmaṁ obhāsetvā, tārā-gaṇa-parivuto viya puṇṇa-cando, bhikkhu-gaṇa-parivuto maṇḍala-māla-majjhē nisinno. Tam ko nāma na jāneyya? Ayam pana attano issariya-lilhāya pucchatī. Pakati h' esā rāja-kulānam, yam sañjanantā pi ajānantā viya pucchanti. Jīvako pana tam sutvā, "Ayaṁ rājā paṭhaviyam thatvā 'Kuhiṁ paṭhavi' ti,

nabham̄ oloketvā 'Kuhim̄ candima-suriyā' ti, Sineru-mūle ḥatvā 'Kuhim̄ Sinerū' ti vadāmāno viya, Dasabalassa purato va ḥatvā 'Kuhim̄ Bhagavā' ti pucchatī. Hand' assa Bhagavantam̄ dassemī' ti, yena Bhagavā ten' añjaliṃ pañāmetvā "Eso Mahārājā" ti ādim āha.

#### C. Sv-ṭ (I 280)

Eke ti Uttaravihāravāsino.

Here also the interpretation of the Uttaravihāravāsins is rejected by Buddhaghosa.

#### 8. Example Fifteen

##### A. DN (I 53 *foll.*)

Cuddasa kho pan' imāni yoni-pamukha-sata-sahassāni saṭṭhiñ ca satāni cha ca satāni, pañca ca kammuno satāni pañca ca kammāni tīni ca kammāni kamme ca adḍha-kamme ca . . .

##### B. Sv (I 161 *foll.*)

Yoni-pamukha-satasahassāni ti, pamukha-yoniyam̄ uttama-yoniyam̄ cudasa-satasahassāni, aññāni ca saṭṭhi-satāni, aññāni ca cha-satāni, pañca ca kammuno satāni ti pañca kamma-satāni c' āti kevalamp̄ takkamattakena niratthakam̄ diṭṭhim̄ dipeti. Pañca ca kammāni tīni ca kammāni ti ādisu pi es' eva nayo. Keci pan' āhu "Pañca kammāni ti pañca-indriyavasena bhaṇati, tīni ti tīni kāya-kammādi-vasenā" ti. Kamme ca adḍha-kamme c' āti, ettha pan' assa kāya-kammañ ca vacī-kammañ ca kamman ti laddhi, mano-kammam̄ upaḍḍha-kamman ti.

##### C. Sv-ṭ (I 289)

Es' eva nayo ti iminā kevalam̄ takkamattakena niratthakam̄ diṭṭhim̄ dipetī ti imam ev' attham̄ atidisati . . . Keci ti Uttaravihāravāsino. Te hi pañca kammāni ti cakkhu-sota-ghāna-jivhā-kāya, imāni pañc' indriyāni pañca kammāni ti paññāpentī ti vadanti.

The passage from DN (A) is also found in MN (I 517), and the comment of Ps (III 230) upon this is also basically identical to that of Sv given above (B). However, the above comment of Sv-ṭ (C) differs from the comment of Ps-ṭ (III 109, 26 *foll.*) upon the parallel passage of Ps. In particular, the comment of Ps-ṭ on "keci" does not agree with the above comment of Sv-ṭ on "keci" and remarks:

**Keci ti Sārasamāsa-ācariyā.**

If Ps-ṭ was written by the same Dhammapāla as the author of Sv-ṭ, what does the difference between these two comments mean? I suggest that when Dhammapāla commented upon this passage of Sv, he consulted the old commentary of the Uttaravihāra, omitting any reference to the Sārasamāsa, while on the other hand, when he commented upon the identical passage of Ps, he paid attention only to the Sārasamāsa, omitting the work of the Uttaravihāra. In many other instances, he consulted the views of both these two works.

#### 9. Example Sixteen

##### A. DN (I 70)

Kathañ ca mahā-rāja bhikkhu sati-sampajāññena samannāgato hoti? Idha mahā-rāja bhikkhu abhikkante paṭikkante sampajāna-kārī hoti, ālokite vilokite sampajāna-kārī hoti, sammiñjite pasārite sampajāna-kārī hoti, saṃghāṭi-patta-cīvara-dhāraṇe sampajāna-kārī hoti, asite pite khāyite sāyite sampajāna-kārī hoti, uccāra-passāvamme sampajāna-kārī hoti, gate ṭhite nisinne sutte jāgarite bhāsīte tuṇhī-bhāve sampajāna-kārī hoti.

## B. Sv (I 184)

Sampajāna-kārī hotī ti, sampajaññinena sabba-kicca-kārī, sampajaññass' eva vā kārī. So hi abhikkantādisu sampajaññam karot' eva, na katthaci sampajaññā-virahito hoti. Tattha sāththaka-sampajaññam sappāya-sampajaññam gocara-sampajaññam asammoha-sampajaññan ti catubbidham sampajaññam. Tattha abhikkamana-citte uppanne citta-vasen' eva agantvā, "Kin nu me ettha gatena attho atthi n' atthi" ti attħānatham pariganetvā attha-parigañhanam sāththaka-sampajaññam. Tattha ca attho ti Cetiyadassana-Bodhidassana-Samghadassana-Theradassana-asubhadassana-ādi vasena dhammadto vadḍhi. Cetiyam disvā pi hi Buddhārammaṇam, Samghadassane Samghārammaṇam pītiṁ uppādetvā, tad eva khayato sammasanto arahattam pāpuṇāti. There disvā tesam ovāde patiṭṭhāya, asubham disvā tattha pathamajjhānam uppādetvā, tad eva khayato sammasanto arahattam pāpuṇāti. Tasmā etesam dassanam sāththam. **Keci** pana āmisato pi vadḍhi attho yeva. Tam nissāya brahmacariyānuggahāya patipannattā ti vadanti.

## C. Sv-ṭ (I 316)

**Keci** ti Abhayagirivāsino.

The above statement of Sv, together with the passages preceding and following it, can be seen in Ps (I 253 *foll.*, especially 253), Spk (I 181 *foll.*, especially 182 *foll.*), and Vibh-a ( 347 *foll.*, especially 347 *foll.*). As regards these three, only Spk-ṭ records the same comment as that of Sv-ṭ shown above (C), i.e. Keci ti Abhayagirivāsino, while the other two Tīkās, Ps-ṭ (I 354, 28) and Vibh-mṭ (180, 27) have no comment of this sort.

## 10. Example Seventeen

A. DN (I 88 *foll.*)

Sace agāram ajjhāvasati rājā hoti cakkavatti dhammiko dhammarājā cāturanto vijitāvi janapadatthāvariyyappatto satta-ratana-samannāgato . . . Paro sahassam kho pan' assa puttā bhavanti sūrā vīraṅga-rūpā parasenappamaddanā.

## B. Sv (I 250)

Sūrā ti abhiruka-jātikā. Vīraṅga-rūpā ti deva-putta-sadisa-kāyā. Evam tāv' **eke** vanṇayanti, ayam pan' ettha sabhāvo. Virā ti uttama-sūrā vuccanti. Virānam aṅgam vīraṅgam, Vīra-kāraṇam viriyan ti vuttam hoti. Vīraṅga-rūpam etesan ti vīraṅga-rūpā, viriyamaya-sarirā viyā ti vuttam hoti.

## C. Sv-ṭ (I 383)

**Eke** ti Sārasamās' ācāriyam āha.

## 11. Example Eighteen

## A. DN (II 14)

Dhammatā esā bhikkhave, yadā Bodhisatto mātu kucchismā nikkhhamati, devā paṭhamam paṭiggañhanti, pacchā manussā. Ayam ettha dhammatā.

## B. Sv (II 437)

Devā paṭhamam paṭiggañhanti ti khīn'āsavā Suddhāvāsa-Brahmāno paṭiggañhanti. Katham? "Sūti-vesam ganhitvā" ti **eke**. Tam pana paṭikkhipitvā idam vuttaṁ: "Tadā Bodhisatta-mātā suvaṇṇa-khacitam vattham nivāsetvā macch' akkhi-sadisam dukūla-paṭṭam yāva pād' antā pārupitvā aṭṭhāsi. Ath' assā sallahukam gabbha-vuṭṭhānam ahosi dhammadarakato udaka-nikkhamana-sadisam. Atha te pakati-Brahma-vesen' eva upasaṅkamityā paṭhamam suvaṇṇa-jālena paṭiggaheṣum; tesam hathato cattāro Mahā-rājāno ajina-ppaveṇiya paṭiggaheṣum; tato manussā dukūla-cumbaṭakena

patiggahesum". Tena vuttam devā paṭhamam patigganṭhanti pacchā manussā ti.

### C. Sv-t (II 36)

**Eke** ti Abhayagirivāsino.

### 12. Example Nineteen

#### A. Sv (II 514 foll.) commenting on DN (II 71)

Ubhato-bhāga-vimutto ti dvīhi bhāgehi vimutto, arūpa-samāpatti� rūpa-kāyato vimutto, maggena nāma-kāyato vimutto ti . . . So pan' esa ubhato-bhāga-vimutto ākāsānañc' āyatana' ādisu aññatarato vuṭṭhāya arahattam patto ca anāgāmi hutvā, nirodhā vuṭṭhāya arahattam patto cā ti: pañcavidho hoti. **Keci** pana yasmā rūpāvacara-catutthajjhānam pi duvaṅgikam upekkhā-sahagataṁ arūpāvacarajjhānam pi tādisam eva, tasmā rūpāvacara-catutthajjhānato vuṭṭhāya arahattam patto pi ubhato-bhāga-vimutto ti. Ayam pana ubhato-bhāga-vimutta-pañño heṭṭhā Lohapāsāde samuṭṭhahitvā Tepitaka-Culla-Sumanatherassa vanṇanam nissāya cirena vinicchayam patto.

Giri-vihāre kira therassa antevāsiko ekassa piñḍa-cārikassa mukhato va tam paññhaṇp sutvā āha: "Āvuso heṭṭhā Lohapāsāde amhākaṁ ācariyassa dhammaro vanṇayato na kenaci sua-pubban?" ti, kim pana bhante therō avacā? ti. "Rūpāvacara-catutthajjhānam kiñcapi duvaṅgikam upekkhā-sahagataṁ kilese ca vikkhambheti, kilesānam pana āsannapakkhe virūhanaṭṭhāne samudācarati. Ime hi kilesā nāma pañca-vokāra-bhave nīl' ādisu aññatarām ārammaṇam upaniśāya samudācaranti. Rūpāvacarajjhānañ ca tam ārammaṇam na samatikkammati, tasmā sabbaso rūpam nivattetvā arūpajjhānavasena kilese vikkhambhetvā arahattam patto va ubhato-bhāga-vimutto". Idam āvuso therō avaca. Idam ca pana vatvā idam suttam āhari: - "Katamo ca puggalo ubhato-bhāga-vimutto? Idh' ekacco puggalo aṭṭha-vimokkhe kāyena phussitvā viharati, paññāya

c' assa disvā āsavā parikkhiṇā honti. Ayaṁ vuccati puggalo ubhato-bhāga-vimutto" ti.

### B. Sv-t (II 155 foll.)

Tattha keci ti Uttaravihāravāsino Sārasamās' ācariyā ca. Te hi: Ubhato-bhāga-vimutto ti ubhayabhāgavimutto samādhivipassanāto ti vatvā rūpāvacarasamādhinā pi samādhiparipanthato vimuttam maññanti. Evaṁ rūpajjhānabhāgena arūpajjhānabhāgena ca ubhato vimutto ti Sārasamāse.

### 13. Example Twenty

#### A. DN (II 213)

Katame cattāro? Idha bho bhikkhu chanda-samādhi-padhāna-saṃkhāra-samannāgataṁ iddhipādaṁ bhāveti, viriya-samādhi . . . citta-samādhi . . . vimaiṣā-samādhi-padhāna-saṃkhāra-samannāgataṁ iddhipādaṁ bhāveti.

#### B. Sv (II 642)

Yath' eva hi chandaṁ adhipatīm karitvā pañiladdha-samādhi chanda-samādhi ti vutto. Evaṁ viriyam cittam vimaiṣam adhipatīm karitvā pañiladdha-samādhi vimaiṣa-samādhi ti vuccati. Api ca upacārajjhānam pādo paṭhamajjhānam iddhi sa-upacāram paṭhamajjhānam pādo dutiyajjhānam iddhi ti. Evaṁ pubbabhāge pādo aparabhāge iddhi ti: evam ettha attho veditabbo; vithārena iddhipāda-kathā Visuddhimagge ca Vibhaṅgaṭṭhakathāya ca vuttā. **Keci** pana: "Nippaññā iddhi anipphanno idhipādo" ti vadanti. Tesam vāda-maddan' athāya Abhidhamme Uttara-cūlikā-vāro nāma āgato. Cattāro iddhipāda: chand' iddhipādo viriy' iddhipādo citt' iddhipādo vimaiṣ' iddhipādo.

#### C. Sv-t (II 268)

**Kecī** ti Abhayagirivāsino. Tesu ekacce "Iddhi nāma anipphannā, iddhipādo nippphoono" ti vadanti. Ekacce "Iddhipādo pi anipphanno" ti vadanti. Anipphanno ti ca param' athato asiddho, n' athi ti attho.

The topic of this example is the interpretation of the "cattāro iddhipādā". As is clear from the above statement in the Dīghaṭṭhakathā, other detailed explanations of the "cattāro iddhipādā" are available in the Visuddhimagga<sup>25</sup> and the Vibhaṅgaṭṭhakathā. Of these two explanations, which are not exactly the same, that of the Vibhaṅgaṭṭhakathā is more closely connected with the above passage from Sv. The Iddhipāda-vibhāga in Vibh-a (308) reads as follows:

Ken' aṭṭhena iddhi? Ken' aṭṭhena pādo ti? Ijhanakaṭṭhen' eva iddhi; patiṭṭhānaṭṭhen' eva pādo. Evam idhāpi iddhi ti vā pādo ti vā aññassa kassaci adhivacanam, sampayuttakānam catunnam khandhānam yeva adhivacanan ti. Evam vutte pana idam āhamṣu: Catunnam khandhānam eva adhivacanam bhaveyya yadi Sattā parato Uttaracūlabhājaniyār nāma na āhareyya; Uttaracūlabhājaniye pana chando yeva chandiddhipādo, viriyam eva, cittam eva, vimamsā va vimamsiddhipādo ti kathitam ti.

Keci pana iddhi nāma anipphannā, iddhipādo nippphoono ti vadimṣu. Tesampi vacanam paṭikkhipitvā iddhi pi iddhipādo pi nippphoono tilakkhaṇabbhāhato ti sanniṭhānam katam.

Upon "keci" in the above passage, the Vibhaṅgaṭīkā (169, 8 foll.) comments as follows:

**Kecī** ti Uttaravihārvāsitherā kira.

For the unnamed sources "keci" in the Aṭṭhakathās which refer to the non-Mahāvihāra fraternity, the respective Ṭikās give as their explanation the apparently alternative names: "Abhayagirivāsino" and "Uttaravihārvāsitherā". This fact does not prove that these

anonymous sources differed from one another, but rather suggests that the names given in the different Ṭikās refer to one and the same group.

#### 4. Examples found in the Majjhimaṭṭhakathā

##### 1. Example Twenty-one

###### A. MN (I 1)

Idha bhikkhave assutavā puthujjano ariyānam adassāvi ariyadhammassa akovido ariyadhamme avinīto sappurisānam adassāvi sappurisadhammassa akovido sappurisadhamme avinīto paṭhavim paṭhavito sañjānāti, paṭhavim paṭhavito saññatvā paṭhavim maññati, paṭhaviyā maññati, paṭhavito maññati, paṭhavim me ti maññati, paṭhavim abhinandati; tam kissa hetu: apariññātaṃ tassā ti vadāmi.

###### B. Ps (I 28)

Paṭhavito maññati ti ettha pana paṭhavito ti missakkavacanam. Tasmā sa-upakaraṇassa attano vā parassa vā yathāvuttappabhedato paṭhavito uppatti vā niggamanam vā, paṭhavito vā añño attā ti maññamāno paṭhavito maññati ti veditabbo. Ayam assa diṭṭhimaññanā. Tasmim yeva pan' assa diṭṭhimaññanāya maññite vatthusmim sineham mānañ ca uppādayato tañhā-mānamaññanā pi veditabbā. **Apare** āhu: Paṭhavikasiṇam parittam bhāvetvā tato ca aññam appamānam attānam gahetvā paṭhavito bahiddhā pi me attā ti maññamāno paṭhavito maññati ti.

###### C. Ps-ṭ (I 74, 25)

###### **Apare** ti Sārasamāsācariyā.

The view of "apare", i.e. the Sārasamāsa-ācariyas, quoted in Ps (B) is not found in the detailed interpretation on "paṭhavi-kasiṇa" in

the Gedatsudōron<sup>26</sup>. We may conclude that it has been extracted from the Sārasamāsa itself, because the passage referred to is a comment upon a particular phrase, "paṭhavito maññati", which can be expounded only in a particular context. The text which expounded a word or a phrase (especially a phrase) in this way must have been a commentary (upon the Canon).

## 2. Example Twenty-two

### A. Ps (I 37 foll.) commenting on MN (I 3 foll.)

Evamp sabbamp sakkāyabhedamp diṭṭhādihi catuhi dassetvā, idāni tam eva samāpannakavārena asamāpannakavārena ca dvidhā dassento, ekattam nānattan ti āha. Ekattan ti iminā hi samāpannakavāram dasseti; nānattan ti iminā asamāpannakavāram. Tesamp vacanatho: ekabhāvo ekattam, nānābhāvo nānattan ti. Yojanā pan' ettha samāpannakavāram catuhi khandhehi, asamāpannakavārañ ca pañcahi khandhehi bhinditvā, "Rūpam attato samanupassatī" ti (S III 44) ādinā sāsana-nayena paṭhavivārādisu vuttena ca aṭṭhakathā-nayena yathānurūpam vimapsitvā veditabbā. **Keci** pana ekattan ti ekattanayañ vadanti, nānattan ti nānattanayañ; **Apare** "Ekattasaññī attā hoti arogo param marañā . . . nānattasaññī attā hoti" ti (D I 31) evamp diṭṭhābhinivesamp. Tam sabbamp idhānadhippetattā ayuttam eva hoti.

### B. Ps-t (I 88, 2-3)

**Keci** ti Abhayagirivāsino.

**Apare** ti Sārasamāsācariyā.

This example is very important. The passage quoted above from Ps (A) refers in parallel to two different views of unnamed groups. These unnamed groups are respectively identified as the Abhayagirivāsins and the Sārasamāsa-ācariyas (B). It means that these two groups were different.

## 3. Example Twenty-three

### A. MN (I 6)

Tasmātiha bhikkhave Tathāgato sabbaso tanhānam khayā virāgā nirodhā cāgā paṭinissaggā anuttaram sammāsambodhim abhisambuddho ti vadāmī ti.

### B. Ps (I 54)

Sammāsambodhin ti sammā sāmaññ ca bodhim. Atha vā pasattham sundaraññ ca bodhim. Bodhī ti rukkho pi, maggo pi, sabbamūtaññānam pi, nibbānam pi. "Bodhirukkhamūle paṭhamābhisambuddho" ti (Vin I 1) ca, "Antarā ca Bodhim antarā ca Gayan" ti (Vin I 8; MN I 170) ca āgataṭṭhānesu hi rukkho bodhi ti vuccati. "Bodhi vuccati catusu maggesuññānam" ti (Nd I 456) āgataṭṭhāne maggo. "Pappoti bodhim varabhūrimedhaso" ti (DN III 159) āgataṭṭhāne sabbamūtaññānam. "Patvāna bodhim amatam asaṅkhatan" ti ( ) āgataṭṭhāne nibbānam. Idha pana Bhagavato arahattamaggaññānam adhippetam. **Apare** pana sabbamūtaññānam ti pi vadanti.

### C. Ps-t (I 115, 3)

**Apare** ti Sārasamāsācariyā.

It is to be noted here that the different explanation of "apare", i.e. the Sārasamāsa-ācariyas, is introduced in parallel with the orthodox view of the Mahāvihāra, yet it is not rejected by Buddhaghosa.

## 4. Example Twenty-four

### A. MN (I 7)

Bhagavā etad avoca: Jānato aham bhikkhave passato āsavānam khayañ vadāmi, no ajānato no apassato . . . ti.

## B. Ps (I 63)

Idāni jānato ahan ti ādisu jānato ti jānantassa. Passato ti passantassa. Dve pi padāni ekaṭṭhāni, byaṭṭjanam eva nānā. Evaṁ sante pi jānato ti nānalakkhaṇam upādāya puggalaṁ niddisati. Jānalakkhaṇam hi nānaṁ. Passato ti nānappabhāvaṁ upādāya. Passanappabhāvaṁ hi nānaṁ. Nānasamaṅgi puggalo, cakkhumā viya cakkhunā rūpāni, nānena vivaṭe dhamme passati. Api ca yoniso manasikāram uppādetum jānato, ayoniso manasikāro yathā na uppajjati evaṁ passato ti. Ayam ettha sāro<sup>27</sup>. Keci pan' ācariyā bahū papañce bhananti. Te imasmim atthe na yujjanti.

## C. Ps-ṭ (I 147, 17-20)

Keci ti Abhayagirivāsi-Sārasamāsācariyā. Te hi "samādhinā jānato vipassanāya passato jānam jānāti passam passati. Evaṁ jānanā samatho passanā vipassanā" ti ca ādinā papañcenti.

## 5. Example Twenty-five

## A. MN (I 8)

So evaṁ ayoniso manasikaroti: Ahosin nu kho aham atitam addhānaṁ, na nu kho ahosiṁ atitam addhānaṁ, kin nu kho ahosiṁ atitam addhānaṁ, kathan nu kho ahosiṁ atitam addhānaṁ, kin hutvā kiṁ ahosiṁ nu kho aham atitam addhānaṁ . . .

## B. Ps (I 69)

Kin nu kho ahosin ti jātilingupapattiyo<sup>28</sup> nissāya, khattiyo nu kho ahosiṁ, brāhmaṇa-vessa-sudda-gahaṭṭha-pabbajita-deva-manussānaṁ aññataro ti kañkhati. Kathan nu kho ti sañṭhānākāraṇi nissāya, digho nu kho ahosiṁ, rassa-odāta-kañha-ppamāṇika-appamāṇikādīnaṁ aññataro ti kañkhati. Keci pana, Issaranimmānādiṇi nissāya kena nu kho kāraṇena ahosin ti hetuto kañkhati ti vadanti. Kiṁ hutvā kiṁ ahosin ti jāti-ādīni nissāya,

khattiyo hutvā nu kho brāhmaṇo ahosiṁ -pe- devo hutvā manusso ti attano paramparamaṁ kañkhati. Sabbatth' eva pana addhānan ti kālādhivacanam etam.

## C. Ps-ṭ (I 155, 29 - 156, 3)

**Keci** ti Sārasamāsācariyā. Te hi "kathaṁ nu kho ti Issarena vā Brahmunā vā pubbakatena vā ahetuto vā nibbatto ti cinteti" ti āhu. Tena vuttam "hetuto kañkhati ti vadanti" ti. Ahetuto nibbatti-kañkhāpi hi hetuparāmasanam evā ti.

It is noteworthy that the above view of "keci", i.e. the Sārasamāsācariyas, in Ps (B) is introduced as a reference, but is not rejected. We can find identical passages in MN (A) and SN (II 26 §18); in Ps (B) and Spk (II 42); and in Ps-ṭ (C) and Spk-ṭ (II 56, 6 foll.). The above passage of Spk-ṭ is the comment upon the above passage of Spk, which is the comment upon that of SN.

## 6. Example Twenty-six

## A. MN (I 21)

Āraddhaṁ kho pana me brāhmaṇa viriyam ahosi asallinam, upaṭṭhitā sati asammuṭṭhā passaddho kāyo asāraddho, samāhitam cittam ekaggam.

## B. Ps (I 123)

Evaṁ Bhagavā Buddhagunapaṭilābhāvasānaṁ attano asammohavihāraṁ brāhmaṇassa dassetvā idāni yāya patipadāya tam koṭipattam asammohavihāraṁ adhigato tam pubbahāgato pabhusi dassetum, āraddhaṁ kho pana me, brāhmaṇā ti ādim āha. Keci pan' āhu: Imam asammohavihāraṁ sutvā brāhmaṇassa cittam evaṁ uppannaṁ: kāya nu kho patipadāya imam patto ti. Tassa cittam aññāya imāyā 'ham patipadāya imam uttamam asammohavihāraṁ patto ti dassento evam āhā ti.

C. Ps-t (I 221, 28 *foli.*)

**Kecī ti Uttaravihāravāsino.**

## 7. Example Twenty-seven

A. MN (I 252 *foll.*)

Ekamantañā nisinnāñ kho Sakkañ devāñāñ indañ āyasmā Mahāmoggallāno etad avoca: Yathākathāñ pana te Kosiya Bhagavā saṅkhittena tañhāsaṅkhayavimuttīñ abhāsi, sādhu mayam pi etissā kathāya bhāgino assāma savanāyāti. - Mayāñ kho mārisa Moggallāna bahukiccā, mayāñ bahukaraṇiyā, app eva sakena karaṇiyena api ca devāñāñ yeva Tāvatimsāñāñ karaṇiyena. Api ca mārisa Moggallāna sussutañ yeva hoti suggahitāñ sumanasikatañ sūpadhāritam yan no khippam eva antaradhāyati . . .

### B. Ps (II 301 *foli.*)

Yan no khippam eva antaradhbāyati ti yamp amhbākamp sīgham eva andhakāre rūpagatamp viya na dissati. Iminā 'ham, bhante, tam pañhavissajjanam na sallakkhemī ti dīpeti. Thero, kasmā nu kho ayamp yakkho asallakkhañhabhāvamp dīpeti, passena pariharati ti āvajjanato, devā nāma mahāmūlhā honti, chadvārikehi ārammanehi nimmathiyamānā attano bhuttābhuttabhāvam pi, pītāpītabhāvam pi na jānānti, idha kataamp eththa mussanti ti aññāsi. Keci pan' āhu: Thero etassa garu bhāvanīyo. Tasmā, idān' eva loke aggapuggalassa santike pañham uggahetvā āgato, idān' eva nātakānam antaram paviñño ti evamp manamp thero tajjeyyā ti bhayena evam āhā ti. Evamp pana kohannīam nāma hoti. Ariyasāvakassa ca kohannīam nāma n' atthi. Tasmā mūlhabhāven' eva na sallakkhesi ti veditabbaamp. Upari kasmā sallakkhesi ti? Thero tassa somanassa-sāmvegam janetvā tamarip nīhari, tasmā sallakkhesi.

C. Ps-t (II 221, 8 *foli.*)

**Kecī ti Sārasamāsācariyā.**

#### 8. Example Twenty-eight

## A. MN (II 262)

Kāyassa bhedā param marañā thānam etam vijjati yaṁ tam sampvattanikam viññānam assa ānañjūpagam. Ayam, bhikkhave, pañhamā ānañjasappāyā paṭipadā akkhāyati.

### B. Ps (IV 61 *foll.*)

Tam sampvattanikarū viññānam assa ānañjūpagan tam kāraṇam vijjati ti attho. Ettha ca tam sampvattanikan ti tassa bhikkhuno sampvattanikarū yena vipākavīññānena so bhikkhu tam sampvattati nibbattati tam viññānam ānañjūpagan ti kusalānañjasabhāvam upagatam assa tādisam eva bhaveyyā ti attho. Keci kusalavīññānam vadanti yan tan tassa bhikkhuno sampvattanikam upapattihetubhūtam kusalavīññānam ānañjūpagatam assa vipākakāle tam nāmakam eva assā ti attho.

### C. Ps-t (III 254, 31)

**Kecī ti Abhayagirivāsino.**

## 5. Example found in the Samyuttaṭṭhakathā

### 1. Example Twenty-nine

### A. SN (I 142)

Tena kho pana samayena Bakassa brahmuno evarūpam pāpakam  
diṭṭhigatam uppannam hoti. Idam niccam idam dhuvaṃ, idam  
sassatam idam kevalam idam acavanadhammam, idam hi na jāyati  
na miyati na cavati na uppajjati, ito ca pan' aññam uttarīm  
nissaranam n' athi ti.

B. Spk (I 208 *foll.*)

Ito ca pan' aññan ti, ito pan' okāsā Brahma-ṭṭhānā uttarim aññam  
nissaranamp nāma n' athī ti. Evam assa thāma-gatā sassata-diṭṭhi  
uppannā hoti. Evan vādī ca pana so upari tisso jhāna-bhūmiyo  
cattāro magge cattāri phalāni nibbānan ti sabbañ paṭibāhati. Kadā  
pan' esā diṭṭhi uppannā? ti. Paṭhama-jjhāna-bhūmiyam nibbatta-  
kāle dutiya-jjhāna-bhūmiyan ti **eke**. Tatr' ayam anupubbī-kathā: -  
Heṭṭh' ūpapattiko kir' esa Brahmā. Anuppanne Buddh' uppāde isi-  
pabbajjam pabbajitvā, kasiṇa-parikammañ katvā, samāpattiyo  
nibbattetvā, aparihīna-jjhāno kālam katvā, catuttha-jjhāna-  
bhūmiyam Vehapphala-brahmaloke pañca-kappa-satikam āyūm  
gahetvā nibbatti. Tattha yāvatāyukam thatvā, heṭṭh' ūpapattikam  
katvā, tatiya-jjhānam pañtam bhāvetvā, Subhakinna-brahmaloke  
catusaṭṭhi-kappañ āyūm gahetvā nibbatti. Tattha dutiya-jjhānam  
bhāvetvā, Ābhassare aṭṭha-kappe āyūm gahetvā nibbatti. Tattha  
paṭhama-jjhānam bhāvetvā, pathama-jjhāna-bhūmiyam kappāyuko  
hutvā nibbatti. So paṭhama-kāle attanā kata-kammañ ca nibbatta-  
ṭṭhānañ ca aññāsi. Kāle yeva pana gacchante ubhayam pamussitvā  
sassata-diṭṭhim uppādesi.

## C. Spk-ṭ (I 241, 26)

**Eke** ti Uttaravihāravāsino.

## 6. Conclusion

All the twenty-nine examples found in the major Aṭṭhakathā texts with reference to the comments or discussions of the Mahāvihāra and the non-Mahāvihāra fraternities, which are recorded in parallel, have been investigated in the previous sections. On the basis of these examples, I shall comment on various aspects of the relation between these two traditions and their respective works.

(1) Of the seven examples found in the Visuddhimagga, the quotations from the non-Mahāvihāra fraternities' views for which

parallel passages can be seen in the Gedatsudōron, the Chinese version of the Vimuttimagga, are only four: Examples 1, 2, 3 and 6. For the remaining three examples, i.e. 4, 5 and 7, no such parallel passages can be found in the Gedatsudōron. As is already well known, the Vimuttimagga, composed by Upatissa of the Abhayagirivihāra, pre-dates the Visuddhimagga written by Buddhaghosa of the Mahāvihāra, and the former text is referred to without attribution as one of the basic source materials for the latter text. Comparative studies of these two doctrinal works have already been done in detail<sup>29</sup>. The Vimuttimagga was not, however, the only text of the Abhayagirivihāra to have been consulted by Buddhaghosa when he was writing the Visuddhimagga. Example 4 mentioned above proves that he referred to a certain old commentary, now lost, of the Uttaravihāra(/Abhayagirivihāra) on the Samyuttanikāya, of which further discussion will be made later. Moreover, examples 5 and 7 suggest that he made use of some other unknown source of the Abhayagirivihāra, besides the above two texts. It might have been some oral transmission on doctrine or a commentarial work which will be considered later.

(2) In regard to the way in which the "different views" of the non-Mahāvihāravāsins are evaluated, the twenty-nine examples can be classified into two groups:

(a) The "different view" is criticised and rejected with some reason or evidence: these examples are 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 13, 14, 18, 19, 20, 22, 24 and 29 - altogether fifteen in number. Most of the examples in the Visuddhimagga are included here.

(b) The "different view" is neither criticised nor rejected. This group is further divided into two:

(i) The "different view" is stated in parallel with the orthodox view of the Mahāvihāravāsins as a supplementary explanation. These

examples are 4, 9 (first half), 10, 11, 15, 16, 17, 21, 23, 25, 26, 27 and 28.

(ii) The orthodox view of the Mahāvihāravāsins is not mentioned, and only the "different view" of the non-Mahāvihāravāsins is introduced. In this case, the orthodox view seems not to have been available to be referred to. These examples are 9 (latter half) and 14.

In any case, it is noteworthy that in fourteen examples, i.e. nearly half of the total, the "different views" of the non-Mahāvihāravāsins are never rejected but recorded either as a supplement in parallel with the orthodox view or as the only reference without any orthodox view. Incidentally, if we exclude the seven examples in the Visuddhimagga, a doctrinal work, of the remaining twenty-two examples, the cases in which the "different view" is rejected are nine in number, and the reverse cases are thirteen: the latter cases are in the majority. As a consequence of the foregoing, we can conclude that, on the one hand, the Mahāvihāra and non-Mahāvihāra fraternities differed from one another especially on some doctrinal points; while, on the other hand, these twin fraternities in the same Theravāda school recognised each other and mutually supplied what was lacking in each other's commentarial source material.

(3) Next I shall proceed to the matter of the identifications which are made of the unnamed sources. As has already been explained in Section One, the expressions of the *Tikās*, which can be regarded as referring to the non-Mahāvihāra fraternity, are "Abhayagirivāsino", "Uttaravīhāravāsino (-vāsikā, -vāsikatherā)", and "Sārasamāsa-ācariyā". The expressions which indicate the names of texts belonging to this fraternity are "Vimuttimagga of Upatissa" and "Sārasamāsa". Table I is intended to give a better understanding of the way in which these five kinds of names have been referred to: (1) the letter 'a' denotes the identification made by the *Tikās* of the unnamed source in the Example concerned - when

## TABLE I

there is more than one reference in a given Example, a second reference is denoted by the letter 'b' and a third by the letter 'c'; (2) when 'a' or 'b' appears against more than one name in respect of a given Example, this is because more than one name is given by the Tīkās for the one reference; whilst (3) a letter in parentheses means that alternative identifications are given in other Tīkās when commenting upon the identical unnamed sources quoted in parallel passages in different Aṭṭhakathās. The commentaries cited are as follows:

- Sv      A: cty on the Brahmajālasutta (DN-1)  
 B: cty on the Sāmanīaphalasutta (DN-2)  
 C: cty on the Ambaṭṭhasutta (DN-3)  
 D: cty on the Mahāpadānasuttanta (DN-14)  
 E: cty on the Mahānidānasuttanta (DN-15)  
 F: cty on the Janavasabhasuttanta (DN-18)
  
- Ps      A: cty on the Mūlapariyāyasutta (MN-1)  
 B: cty on the Sabbāsavasutta (MN-2)  
 C: cty on the Bhayabheravasutta (MN-4)  
 D: cty on the Cūlatañhāsañkhayasutta (MN-37)  
 E: cty on the Āṇaṭṭjasappāyasutta (MN-106)
  
- Spk    Cty on the Brahmasamīyutta (SN-6)

From this Table, the following conclusions can be drawn:

- (1) With respect to the Visuddhimagga, the name of the Abhayagirivāsins is the most frequent, and the Vimuttimagga of Upatissa is expressly mentioned. Yet the Visuddhimagga makes no reference to the Sārasamāsa.
  
- (2) In contrast to this, in the Dīghanikāya, the references to the Sārasamāsa and the Sārasamāsa-ācariyas are in the majority, and the name of the Uttaravihāravāsins is the next most frequent. Throughout the whole commentary on the Dīghanikāya, only the

parts commenting on six suttas headed by the Brahmajālasutta contain the names under consideration. (Other anonymous sources are found in the parts of the Dīghanikāya which comment upon these and other suttas).

(3) In the Majjhimaṭṭhakathā also, the references to the Sārasamāsa-ācariyas are in the majority. The parts of the commentary in which the names under consideration can be seen are limited to the sections commenting upon only five suttas headed by the Mūlapariyāyasutta.

(4) With regard to the examples in which more than one name is given for the same unnamed source (i.e. the names with the same marks in the same examples in the diagram), the grouping together of the Uttaravihāravāsins with the Sārasamāsa-ācariyas is the most frequent: five (or six) in all; and there is one instance of the grouping of the Abhayagirivāsins and Sārasamāsa-ācariyas. The grouping of the Abhayagirivāsins with the Uttaravihāravāsins, however, does not occur. It is quite clear from Example 22 that the Abhayagirivāsins were never identical with the Sārasamāsa-ācariyas. In this example, the "keci" who are first referred to are the Abhayagirivāsins, and "apare" who are next referred to are the Sārasamāsa-ācariyas. The textual evidence in Example 20 proves positively that the Abhayagirivāsins and the Uttaravihāravāsins were one and the same. This conclusion agrees with the fact that the grouping of these two as different fraternities does not occur, as described above. Therefore the Abhayagirivāsins, i.e. the Uttaravihāravāsins, were entirely different from the Sārasamāsa-ācariyas.

(5) Next it will be asked what the Abhayagirivāsins, i.e. the Uttaravihāravāsins, and the Sārasamāsa-ācariyas really were. In this respect, the view of Professor de Silva should be considered here. She also considered the grouping of the above three kinds of names. As an explanation for the fact that there is a grouping of the Sārasamāsa-ācariyas with the Uttaravihāravāsins in the material

she investigated (i.e. DAT), but none of the former with the Abhayagirivāsins, she stated as follows<sup>30</sup>:

"Soon after the dissension in the Buddhist church during the reign of Vaṭṭagāmini Abhaya, the schismatics came to be called Abhayagirkā as opposed to the orthodoxy - the Mahāvihārikā. This usage may have gone on until the time of Goṭhābhaya. The Nikāyasāṅgrahava records that during the reign of Goṭhābhaya (A.D. 309-22) an influential monk named Ussiliyatissa declined to accept the Vaitulyavāda, though the residents of Abhayagiri welcomed the new doctrine, and went to reside at the Dakkhināgiri together with a retinue of 500 monks. This group, under the leadership of Sāgala, came to be called Sāgaliyas. Perhaps it was after this event that the headquarters at Abhayagiri came to be designated Uttaravihāra to distinguish it from the sub-division at Dakkhināgiri. Now, both Uttaravihāra and Dakkhināgiri are heterodox, therefore they are both included in the name of the first schismatics, i.e. Abhayagirivāsino. When the term Uttaravihāra is used it only means the section at the headquarters. Therefore when DAT identifies a view as being held by the Abhayagirivāsins, it virtually means non-Mahāvihāravāsins, and has a wide connotation. But when it uses Uttaravihāra, only the headquarters of the heterodox schools set at Abhayagiri is to be understood."

With reference to this view, I can agree in part, yet cannot agree entirely. Only the examples in the Dighaṭṭhakathā were examined by Professor de Silva in the process of editing the PTS edition of the Dīghanikā. That is to say, the material for her search was very limited. She did not refer to Example 24 in the Majjhimaṭṭhakathā, nor the examples in the Visuddhimagga, although the latter had been studied to a certain extent. (This is a weak point of her methodology). Certainly, the discussion would

be simpler and clearer were we to regard Abhayagirivāsin as the name of the whole of the non-Mahāvihāra fraternity, including the Dakkhināgirivihāra, and the Uttaravihāravāsin as the name only of the headquarters of the heterodox fraternities at Abhayagiri. I do not think, however, that in reality these names were so strictly defined or were used in that way. Nevertheless, I consider it reasonable for her to have suggested that the Sārasamāsa-ācariyas were the group of monks in the Dakkhināgirivihāra, forming a sub-fraternity of the Abhayagirivihāra.

Now I shall state my view. Although the original name of the Abhayagirivihāra which was founded by king Vaṭṭagāmaṇi Abhaya was "Abhayagiri", being named after a part of his name, there is the possibility that from the beginning this vihāra was also called the Uttaravihāra (North Monastery) because of its location to the north of Anurādhapura, the then capital of Sri Lanka. Moreover, as the Mahāvihāra was situated in the central part of the capital, and as the Dakkhināgirivihāra was in the southern part, the Abhayagiri was always regarded as the "monastery of the north" by the monks of these two monasteries.

In any case, of the twelve examples in which the name of the Uttaravihāravāsins is referred to in the Ṭīkās, in five (or six) examples their name is referred to in parallel with that of the Sārasamāsa-ācariyas. This fact shows that there was a clear contrast between these two groups. The Sārasamāsa-ācariyas must have been the monks who lived in the Dakkhināgirivihāra mentioned above and who composed and transmitted a work entitled "Sārasamāsa". Consequently, the Abhayagirivihāravāsins were identical with the Uttaravihāravāsins, and the Sārasamāsa-ācariyas were identical with the Dakkhināgirivāsins. Among the forty-three references to these names in all, the references concerning the Abhayagirivihāra in general are twenty-five in number, and those concerning the Dakkhināgirivihāra in general are eighteen in number. However, if we omit the seven references contained in the Visuddhimagga, which does not refer to the

Sārasamāsa, the remaining thirty-six references which appear in the commentarial texts such as Sv, Ps and Spk are equally divided into eighteen from the Abhayagirivāsins, or the Uttaravihāravāsins, and another eighteen from the Sārasamāsa-ācariyas or the "Sārasamāsa". This suggests that generally speaking these two sources were treated as equally authoritative and were referred to in these commentaries.

(6) Finally, I shall put in order the unattributed sources from which the views of "some" were quoted. As has already been described in (1) of this Section, of the seven examples found in the Visuddhimagga, the four headed by Example 1 are from the Vimuttimagga of the Abhayagirivihāra, though this source is not acknowledged. The source for Example 4 was the old commentary, now lost, of the Abhayagiri fraternity on the Samyuttanikāya. The sources for the remaining two are still unknown, which suggests that some other unknown texts or oral transmission on doctrinal matters of this fraternity existed in the past.

It has been shown clearly that a text entitled "Sārasamāsa" of the Dakkhināgirivihāra, the sub-fraternity of the Abhayagirivihāra, must have existed. It can be deduced that the quotations from Sārasamāsa-ācariyas were in fact from the Sārasamāsa itself. Judging from the contents of the quotations from the Sārasamāsa, this text can be regarded as being a commentary on the Nikāyas. For instance, as in Example 8 which is the explanation of the word "sāciyoga", most of the quotations from this text consist of interpretations of something or descriptions of something. Moreover, in Examples 22 and 24, the quotations are interpretations of words which form a pair ("ekatta" and "nānatta"; "jānato" and "passato"), and in Examples 21, 25 and 27 what is being interpreted is not a word but a phrase consisting of several words ("pathavito maññati"; "kathaṁ nu kho ahosiṁ"; and "yan no khippam eva antaradhbāyati"). These phrases, needless to say, make sense only in a particular context, and can be properly expounded

upon only in relation to a particular sentence. From the above discussion, it is clear that the text named "Sārasamāsa" was a work which commented in detail upon passages from specific suttas; yet it was not a systematic thesis on doctrine such as the Visuddhimagga or the Vimuttimagga. Through the investigation of the instances concerned, this text seems to have been a commentary upon (at least) DN, MN, SN, and AN. Incidentally, as to the commentary on AN, there is no example except the duplicated ones (36 and 37 in the list of Section One), but it is rather difficult to imagine the existence of a commentary on the first three Nikāyas alone. At the same time, it is also difficult to imagine the existence of a single commentary on all five Nikāyas, though I have no Tikā material to help me to examine any references to such a source in the commentaries on the fifteen texts of the Khuddakanikāya. On the other hand, we find one example in Pp-A (No. 41) as the only instance in the Abhidhamma-piṭaka commentary concerning the Sārasamāsa. This is, however, a duplicate of passages in three other commentaries, i.e. Sv, Ps and Mp. To sum up, I believe the Sārasamāsa to have been a commentary of the Dakkhināgirivihāra on the first four Nikāyas as stated above.

Next, what was the source material, besides the source for the Visuddhimagga, from which the interpretation of the Abhayagirivāsins, i.e. the Uttaravihāravāsins, was quoted? As has already been explained, of the examples concerning this group, Examples 8, 9, 10, 19 and 24 are common to the Sārasamāsa. Examples 12, 14, 16, 18, 26, 28 and 29 show interpretations of words or phrases, which can make sense only in particular contexts. Example 12 is typical on this point: as discussed before, the phrase commented upon is "te devā" (these heavenly beings) and this cannot possibly be properly interpreted independent of its context. From the above evidence, this source was beyond all doubt a commentary upon the canon. As regards the subjects of its comment, the great majority are from the first four Nikāyas, while a few are from Abhidhamma-piṭaka texts such as Dhs

(No.38), Vibh (Nos.39-40), and Pp (No.41). However, as to the examples concerning AN and these three Abhidhamma-piṭaka texts, the situation is exactly the same as with the Sārasamāsa. The examples concerning these texts are duplicated by passages in other Nikāyas.

This commentary, as the Sārasamāsa, can be regarded neither as a commentary on the first *three* Nikāyas, i.e. DN, MN and SN, nor as a commentary on both the Nikāyas and the Abhidhamma-piṭaka. Therefore, as in the case of the Sārasamāsa, this text must have been a commentary on the first *four* Nikāyas. This unacknowledged commentary that is lost today must have been the "Uttaravihāra-ṭṭhakathā". This text is referred to at eight places in the Mahāvamsaṭīkā<sup>31</sup>, and is sometimes referred to as the "Uttaravihāravāsinampi ṭṭhakathā". In this connection, the same Ṭīkā quotes from another text of the Abhayagiri fraternity, i.e. the "Uttaravihāravāsinampi Mahāvamsa"<sup>32</sup>, that is now also lost.

Saitama, Japan

Sodō Mori

\* I am grateful to Mr. K. R. Norman of the University of Cambridge for the discussions that I had with him about this subject during my stay in England in 1985 and for one year since.

#### Notes

Abbreviations are as in the Epilegomena to V. Trenckner, A Critical Pāli Dictionary, Vol I, Copenhagen 1924-1928. In addition, Chṭ = Chaṭṭhasaṅgāyana edition; Ged = Gedatsudōron; JIABS = Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies; Nanden = Nanden Daizōkyō; SHB = Simon Hewavitarne Bequest edition; Sv-ṭ = Dighaṭīkā; Taishō = Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō; Vim = Vimuttimagga.

References to Pāli texts are to PTS editions except for the following: Vism-mhṭ = B. N. Shukla, Rewatadhamma eds., Visuddhimagga with Paramatthamañjūṣāṭīkā, 3 vols, Varanasi, 1969-72; Ps-ṭ I, II = Mūlapaññāṣāṭīkā I, II; Ps-ṭ III = Majjhimapaññāṣāṭīkā and Uparipaññāṣāṭīkā; Spk-ṭ, Mp-ṭ, Vibh-ṭ, Pp-ṭ (in Ppk-ṭ) being Chṭ editions.

<sup>1</sup> This is a revised and abridged translation of Part IV of my book entitled Pāli bukkyō chūsaku bunken no kenkyū: Attakatā no jōzabu-teki yōsō or A Study of the Pāli Commentaries: Theravādic Aspects of the Ṭṭhakathās, Tokyo, Sankibō Busshorin 1984, 19, 6, viii, 8, 718pp. The original title (in England) of that Part (pp 559-689) is "Comparison of Views between the Mahāvihārikas and the Abhayagirikas' Lineage: An Aspect of the Commentaries".

<sup>2</sup> This refers to the Visuddhimagga and the direct commentaries on the Pāli canon. They are sometimes called in this article the Ṭṭhakathās, the Ṭṭhakathā texts, or the (Pāli) commentaries.

<sup>3</sup> Sodō Mori, op cit (n 1), pp 128-139.

<sup>4</sup> Sodō Mori, "The Vitandavādins (Sophists) as Seen in the Pāli Ṭṭhakathās", in Essays on the Pāli and Buddhist Civilization, or Pāli bukkyō bunka kenkyū, edited by the Pāli Bunka Kenkyūkai, Tokyo, Sankibō-Busshorin, 1982, pp 171-188.

<sup>5</sup> The list of all of them is available in my work (n 1), pp 111-128.

<sup>6</sup> Nyanatiloka, trans., Der Weg zur Reinheit, Konstanz, Verlag Christiani, 1931-42. Ex. p 93, n 126 (p 873); p 123, n 79 (p 876); p 175, n 146 (p 883); p 309, n 133 (p 904); p 511, n 42 (p 916); p 842.

<sup>7</sup> Kōgen Mizuno, The Shōjōdōron, 3 vols, (Nanden, Vols 62-64), Tokyo, Daizō Shuppan, 1937-40. Ex I-160, 206, n 8 (p 219), 293; II-79, 420; III-26, 480.

<sup>8</sup> Bhikkhu Nyanamoli, trans., The Path of Purification, Colombo, R. Semage, 1956. Ex. pp 180, n 18; 104, n 19; 154, n 32; 287, n 38; 474, n 25; 502, n 31; 822, n 5.

<sup>9</sup> P. V. Bapat, Vimuttimagga and Visuddhimagga: a Comparative Study, Poona, 1937. Ex. pp xli, 24, 35, 49 n 2, 95, 127 n1.

<sup>10</sup> Lily de Silva, ed., Dighanikāyāṭṭhakathāṭīkā, Linatthavannanā, 3 vols, London, PTS 1970. Vol I, pp lviii-lxv.

<sup>11</sup> I. B. Horner, "Keci: 'Some' in a Pāli Commentary", JIABS, Vol I, No 2, 1979, pp 52-56; "Keci: 'Some' in the Pāli Commentaries", JPTS, Vol IX, 1981, pp 87-95.

<sup>12</sup> Here the Ṭīkās refer to the Paramatthamañjūṣā: Visuddhimagga Mahāṭīkā and the commentaries on the Ṭṭhakathās of the Pāli canon, except for the commentaries on the Khuddakāṭṭhakathās, which either do not exist or have not been published.

<sup>13</sup> P. V. Bapat, Vimuktimārga Dhutaguna-nirdeśa, New York, Asia Publishing House, 1964, pp 74-76. Cf Genjun Sasaki, Gedatsudōron, Kyoto, Hōzōkan, 1958, p 56.

<sup>14</sup> "Pakkhanda" (PTS ed.) and "pakkhanta" (HOS ed.) have been emended to "pakkhanna" by Professor Mizuno (Nanden, Vol 62, p 299, n 53).

<sup>15</sup> Following the HOS edition (p 221), the reading "paṭiyekko" in the PTS edition has been emended to "pātiyekko".

<sup>16</sup> Following the HOS edition (p 221), the reading "secanako" in the PTS edition has been emended to "asecanako".

<sup>17</sup> Spk III 270.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. Taishō, Vol 32, p 443b.

<sup>19</sup> Ps-t II 160, 1.

<sup>20</sup> Mp-t II 374, 24.

<sup>21</sup> Pp-mt p 61, 13 (in the Tīkā on Ppk-a).

<sup>22</sup> Following Sv-t, the reading "uddha-lomi" in both DN and Sv has been emended to "uddha-lomi".

<sup>23</sup> See n 22.

<sup>24</sup> The original "Paranimmitta" has been corrected to "Paranimmita".

<sup>25</sup> Vism II 385; cf. Ged (Taishō, Vol 32, p 441c).

<sup>26</sup> Taishō, Vol 32, p 412b *foll.*

<sup>27</sup> The reading "saro" in the PTS edition has been corrected to "sāro", following the SHB edition's Ps (I 58, 35) and the Chṭ edition's Ps (I 65, 22).

<sup>28</sup> The reading "jātilinguppattiyo" in the PTS edition has been emended to "jātilingupapattiyo", following the SHB edition's Ps (Vol 35, p 64, 7) and the Chṭ edition's Ps (I 71, 21).

<sup>29</sup> See n 9. Cf. Kōgen Mizuno, "Gedatsudōron to Shōjōdōron no Hikaku-kenkyū - P. V. Bapat, Vimuttimagga and Visuddhimagga", Buddhist Studies, (old edition), Vol III, No 2, May 1939, pp 114-137 (a detailed review article on Bapat's work).

<sup>30</sup> de Silva, op cit (n 10), p lxi.

<sup>31</sup> Mhv-t pp 125, 155, 177, 187, 247, 249, 289, 290.

<sup>32</sup> ibid, p 134.

## Chinese Passages

a.問、誰名頭陀分。頭陀有幾種法。....。

答、有十三頭陀、是佛所說、佛所制戒、此謂頭陀分。此不應說善不善無記。

b.問、此三行何因緣。云何可知此欲行人、此瞋行人、此癡行人。....。答、初所造因緣、諸行界為因緣、過患為因緣。云何諸行初所造因緣。於初可愛方便故、多善業成欲行人、復從天堂落生於此。多起殺割柄械怨業成瞋行人、不愛業所覆、從地獄從龍生、墮落生此。初多飲酒離間、成癡行人、從畜生墮落生此。如是行初造因緣。云何界為因緣。二界最近故、成癡行人、所謂地界水界。二界最近故、成瞋行人、所謂火界風界。四界等故、成欲行人。如是諸行界為因緣。云何過患為因緣。最多痰成欲行人、最多瞋成瞋行人、最多風成癡行人。復有說、最多痰成癡行人、最多風成欲行人。如是過患因緣。

c.(三種善者、謂初中後善。以清淨修行為初善、以捨增長為中善、以歡喜為後善。)云何清淨修行、謂諸善資具。云何捨增長、是謂安定。云何為歡喜、是謂為觀。如是初禪成三種善。

d.問曰、云何念安般。何修、何相、何味、何處、何功德、云何修行。答曰、安者入、般者出、於出入相、彼念隨念正念、此謂念安般。心住不亂、此謂修。令起安般想為相。觸思惟為味。斷覺為處。何功德者、若人修行念安般、成寂寂、成勝妙、成莊嚴可愛、自娛樂。

e.云何四大所造色。眼入、耳入、鼻入、舌入、身入、色入、聲入、香入、味入、女根、男根、命根、身作、口作、虛空界色、輕色、軟色、堪受持色、增長色、相續色、生色、老色、無常、揣食、處色、眠色。

f.Taisho Vol.32,p.461a: 問、阿那含人為果定現觀、何故性除無隔、阿羅漢道不生。答、非樂處故、不生觀見、無力故。